



NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS  
CIVIL AIR PATROL  
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AUXILIARY  
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA  
36112-6332

28 January 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR NHQ CAP/EX

FROM: NHQ CAP/DO

SUBJECT: Comments on Draft CAPR 60-3, *CAP Emergency Services Training and Operational Missions*

1. Attached is the final draft of CAPR 60-3, *CAP Emergency Services Training and Operational Missions*. CAPR 60-3 was first posted for comments on 25 April 2003, and the 60-day comment period expired on 24 June 2003. CAP-USAF gave us their inputs right before the November NEC. Since CAP-USAF's changes were extensive, CAPR 60-3 was posted for a second 60-day comment period on 19 November 2003. The second 60-day comment period expired on 18 January 2004.
2. Attached is a summary of the 92 recommended changes that were received during the comment periods. Seventy of the recommended changes were determined to have merit and are recommended for approval. There were also 22 changes or suggestions recommended from the field that were not incorporated into this draft regulation. These are also noted in this attachment with an explanation as to why they were not incorporated.
3. CAPR 60-3 governs the Emergency Services program of Civil Air Patrol when performing duties as the Air Force Auxiliary. The final draft of this regulation has been coordinated with appropriate directorates in CAP and CAP-USAF.

//Signed//  
JOHN A. SALVADOR  
Director, Operations

Attachments:

1. Summary of Recommended Changes to CAPR 60-3
2. Draft CAPR 60-3, *CAP Emergency Services Training and Operational Missions*.

1<sup>st</sup> Ind to NHQ CAP/DO, 28 January 2004, Comments on Draft CAPR 60-3, *CAP Emergency Services Training and Operational Missions*

NHQ CAP/EX

MEMORANDUM FOR NATIONAL BOARD MEMBERS

The summary of comments received and a final draft of CAPR 60-3 are forwarded to you, in accordance with CAPR 5-1, for discussion/ratification during the March 2004 National Board Meeting.

//Signed//  
ALBERT A. ALLENBACK  
Executive Director

Attachments:  
n/c

cc:  
NHQ CAP/DO/DOS/XPP/LGRF  
HQ CAP-USAF/CC

## **Summary of Recommended Changes to CAPR 60-3**

### Changes incorporated into CAPR 60-3

1. All references to CAPR 111-2 were replaced with language to refer personnel to HQ CAP/GC. CAPR 111-2 is still in coordination, but personnel still need to know who to contact for interim guidance.
2. On page 2, paragraph 1-3 was updated to reflect how supplements, waivers, and operating instructions can be approved.
3. On page 2, in paragraph 1-4a1), a clarification was made to allow rosters to be provided on-line, with paper copies kept locally. Additionally, at the request of several wings on-line alert rosters are only being distributed to national counterparts. Many wings noted that updating alert rosters locally can be impersonal, and can also be problematic when some local organizations are not as well organized to receive alert rosters as our federal counterparts. Some wings were also concerned that electronic rosters were not being updated often enough from the personnel system, and changes have been made to update national counterparts of any changes daily.
4. On page 3, based on recommendations from the MIMS committee, the words “validate, and approved” were deleted from paragraph 1-4b4)c) to allow wings to utilize other local system to validate and approve emergency services specialty qualifications. Wings will are still required to update the MIMS database at national headquarters on a regular basis so that Air Force requests for information can be met in a timely manner and training funds be distributed fairly.
5. On page 3, a note was added to paragraph 1-4b4) at the request of New Mexico wing to allow this responsibility to be delegated to assistants or subordinate unit commanders, directors of operations, or emergency services officers, though they must still have access to the information to effectively do their job.
6. On page 3, in paragraph 1-4c1), “Maintain all documentation required on a CAPF 114.” was removed.
7. On page 3, in paragraph 1-4c4), a clarification was made to allow commanders to designate personnel to validate or approve completion of achievements in MIMS so that commanders would not be unnecessarily burdened with this task. Additionally, commanders or their designees were tasked with maintaining CAPF 114 folders, since paper records of member achievements will only be kept at the unit of assignment now.
8. On page 4, in paragraph 1-9d, a clarification was made to note what is required to document member-owned asset usage on missions.
9. On page 5, in paragraph 1-9e, a clarification was made to note the lack of coverage for mission personnel not properly qualified. Additionally, the maximum allowed number of trainees that can be supervised was increased from three to five.
10. On page 4, in paragraph 1-9f, command authority of senior members over cadets was further defined so that senior members exercising this authority would be expected to justify their actions when assuming command from a cadet when the senior member is assigned to a subordinate position.

11. On page 6, at the request of Oregon wing “by all that have a need to know” was added to paragraph 1-12f because of security concerns associated with some missions CAP is now performing.
12. On page 6, in paragraph 1-12h, approval to fly relatives and friends of a search target was delegated to the National Operations Center for approval on a case-by-case basis.
13. On page 6, in paragraph 1-12i, mission reporting was removed as it is included in SITREPs described in this paragraph.
14. On page 6, the last sentence of paragraph 1-13a1) was changed at the request of the Mississippi wing to emphasize safety and effectiveness.
15. On page 7, paragraph 1-13d was added at the request of Oregon wing to allow appropriately trained and qualified ICs, ALs, OSCs, PSCs, and AOBDs to release mission flights, not just ICs as has been previous policy.
16. On page 7, in paragraph 1-14b2), a clarification of the varied ground team capabilities was added at the request of several wings.
17. On page 7, in paragraph 1-14b5), a clarification was made to specify that members operating corporate or member-owned vehicles on missions must do so in accordance with CAPR 77-1.
18. On page 7, in paragraph 1-15c, the requirement to document agency liaisons in writing was removed since they will be tracked in MIMS. At the request of several wings, it was also noted in this paragraph that some wings may not have the need for many qualified ICs.
19. On page 8, the word “military” was deleted from paragraph 1-16b as it was unnecessary.
20. On page 8, a note was placed after paragraph 1-16b2) to limit firefighting efforts to logistical and other safe support after sever wings expressed concern with personnel being involved in operations that are potentially beyond their capabilities.
21. On page 8, “explosive ordnance” was removed from paragraph 1-16b3) at the request of Pennsylvania wing.
22. On page 8, at the request of Pennsylvania wing, a recommended time frame of 24 hours was placed into paragraph 1-16c so that members know when written requests should be expected. Paragraph 1-16c was also clarified at the request of the National Capital wing to explain the context of military commanders in the sentence.
23. On page 8, the AFRCC phone number was updated to 1-800-851-3051 in paragraph 1-16d1).
24. On page 8, the delegation authority to authorize 911T missions in paragraph 1-16d2) was expanded to include the wing chief of staff at the request of several wings since the emergency services and operations staff traditionally works for the chief of staff at the wing level. The paragraph was also changed at the request of the Mississippi wing to include incapacitation of the wing commander should the commander have an accident.

25. On page 9, paragraph 1-17 from the draft was removed from the regulation because counterpart agencies have agreed to authorize missions to and from mission sites.
26. On page 9, in the current paragraph 1-17, the allowance of copies of mission records to be kept rather than originals was made since some originals must be forwarded to the lead agency for safe keeping in accordance with existing agreements.
27. On page 9, the reference in paragraph 1-20e to paragraph 6-3e was corrected to reference paragraph 5-3e.
28. On page 10, in paragraph 1-26a, the limitations for night vision devices established by CAP-USAF were corrected to match aircrew requirements in CAPR 60-1, and place appropriate limitations on ground personnel.
29. On page 11, an example was added to paragraph 1-27d4) to clarify what types of urban search and rescue should be conducted as technical specialties.
30. Throughout chapter 2, allowances were made for entry and tracking of qualifications in MIMS.
31. On page 12, "and members cannot certify their own training" was added to paragraph 2-2a at the request of Oregon wing to avoid some members falsifying their own records.
32. On page 12, paragraph 2-2a was changed based on a recommendation from the Mississippi wing to make it clear that evaluators could be one or the other of 2-2a1) or 2-2a2).
33. On page 12, paragraph 2-2a1) was changed at the request of several wings to delete the requirement for appointment by the wing commander or their designee to be a qualified evaluator for any specialty. The value of educating evaluators was recognized, but most wings noted that this training in conjunction with qualification in the specialty was enough to be a qualified evaluator. It just adds too much work to require all evaluators to be individually appointed, especially in larger wings. Some wings may want to limit their evaluators further, and can do so through an approved supplement.
34. On pages 12 through 16, the incident commander, agency liaison, and ground team member specialties were broken into three qualification levels. This will allow personnel working on qualifying in these specialties to become qualified sooner and continue training for missions requiring additional experience and knowledge. It also allows CAP to begin resource typing just as many of our federal counterparts have already done. Changes were also made to attachments 4 and 5 to reflect these new specialties.
35. On pages 12 and 13, text was added to paragraph 2-2d at the request of the Mississippi wing to reflect the on-line process of issuing CAPFs 101 so that members or unit commanders can print approved CAPF 101s.
36. On page 13, paragraph 2-2d2) was added to allow wing, region, and national emergency services school directors to issue CAPFs 101 for graduates at the request of several wings. Several regions and national headquarters conduct emergency services schools, and can and should issue 101 cards for their graduates since the members receiving training did not

receive it in their home wing. Wing commanders authorize their personnel to participate in region and national events so they would know up front about personnel attending these courses, and this would relieve burden on their staff for training conducted elsewhere.

37. On page 13, paragraphs 2-2e and 2-2g from the draft were combined based on a recommendation from the Mississippi wing since they were very similar.

38. On page 13, paragraph 2-2e was changed to allow for properly documented trainees participating under qualified supervisors. This allows personnel to participate utilizing multiple methods of documenting trainee status.

39. On page 13, paragraph 2-2f was changed to remove the requirement for IC and AL training status to be tracked in MIMS. Though trainee status will still be capable of being tracked in MIMS, wings will not be required to do so unless they choose.

40. On pages 13 through 18, paragraph 2-3, several wings suggested allowing personnel to move into varied management positions when the member is not current in their current position. Though this was acceptable in many cases, it was determined that for key positions entailing or responsible for high risk activities (i.e., aircrew members, ground team members, agency liaisons and incident commanders) that the Air Force wanted personnel to be current before progressing. As is the case now, members are not required to keep subordinate specialties current after they have progressed, though they often do so anyway. Additionally, rather than referring to electronic lists of task requirements as was shown for the draft, several commanders suggested simply referring to the task guides and having on the job training sign-offs in those publications for members to document completion of requirements. This was incorporated throughout these paragraphs.

41. On page 13, a clarification was added to paragraph 2-3 at the request of Oregon wing to more clearly define what two missions are in reference to training performance standards. Additionally, several wings suggested highlighting the steps in becoming qualified in the paragraph so that members could recognize them, though they felt the text met the needs.

42. On page 13, paragraph 2-3a was changed to allow personnel complete ICS 100 level training or higher en lieu of the introductory ICS portion of CAPT 116 at the request of Oregon wing.

43. On page 14, paragraph 2-3f1)a) corrected "Incident Commander" to "Agency Liaison".

44. On pages 15, 17, and 18 the prerequisite of being a mission staff assistant was added to paragraphs 2-3j, 2-3k, 2-3w, 2-3bb, and 2-3cc at the request of several wings to make sure those staff members had the experience needed to do their jobs.

45. On page 15, the prerequisite of being a communications unit leader was added to paragraph 2-3j at the request of Oregon wing since the logistics section chief is expected to supervise communications unit leaders.

46. On page 16, the 50 hours of cross-country flying prerequisite was removed from paragraph 2-3n since it is already a requirement of another prerequisite.

47. On page 16, paragraph 2-3r was changed to remove the requirement for driver's licenses for ground team leaders. There were several comments received on this subject ranging

from requiring CAP and state driver's licenses for every member that is eligible to not requiring them at all since the wings will only assign vehicles to those with valid driver's licenses. Additionally, many wings commented that they would rather not have the team leader be required to drive the team, as the team leader's responsibilities could be distracting if they are also driving. Requiring driver's licenses for all eligible members is extreme and has the potential for increased risk and accidents so that option was not accepted. Since vehicles are traditionally assigned to appropriately credentialed personnel, requirements to drive CAP vehicles are already noted in paragraph 1-14b5), and driver's license information is now tracked in MIMS for all personnel, we felt it appropriate to remove the requirement for ground team leaders to have a license. To avoid further burden on the mission staff, the 101 card can be altered nationally to identify those with a valid CAP or state driver's license in the future.

48. On page 17, the prerequisite of flight line marshaller was added to paragraph 2-3x at the request of several wings to require flight line supervisors to have the basic training of the marshallers they supervise.

49. On page 18, paragraph 2-4a was changed from "2 years" to "3 years" based on removal of paragraph 2-4b2) (see below).

50. On page 19, paragraphs 2-4b2) and 3) from the draft regulation were replaced. The requirements for personnel to participate in a specialty or equivalent once every two years and to complete tasks from the Mission Essential Task List (METL) and Annual Recurrency Task (ART) list have been replaced by periodic skills evaluations similar to the CAPFs 91 accomplished by mission pilots already. Periodic skills evaluations will accomplish more than simple participation by the membership by allowing members to adequately demonstrate currency and proficiency in their skills, and also gives the members an extra year to meet currency requirements. Based on a suggestion from the Oregon Wing, currently qualified personnel are being given 3 years from the issuance of the regulation to complete this new requirement so that there is no question as to when current personnel will expire.

51. On page 19, throughout paragraph 2-4b2) "interchangeable specialties" was replaced with "equivalent specialties" to be consistent with Attachment 4 at the request of the Virginia Wing.

52. On page 19, a sentence was added to paragraph 2-4b2) to allow the member evaluations conducted every three years to not be limited to Air Force assigned missions at the request of Pennsylvania wing.

53. On page 19, a sentence was added to paragraph 2-4b4) to explain the format of CAPT 117 at the request of the National Capital wing.

54. On page 19, a sentence was added to paragraph 2-6 at the request of National Capital wing to indicate that electronic records will transfer automatically once the transfer is processed at national headquarters.

55. Throughout chapter 3, allowances were made for regions and national to run Air Force Training and Evaluation missions. Many regions have requested to do so, but the language in the prior regulation was unnecessarily restrictive.

56. On page 20, paragraph 3-3c was combined with paragraph 3-4d for ease of reading.

57. On page 20, the second “CAP/DO” was removed from paragraph 3-3c5).
58. On page 20, a clarification was made to paragraph 3-4a at the request of Oregon wing in reference to detailed training scenarios so that the staff would know that minute by minute details were not necessary.
59. On page 21, paragraph 3-4c was updated to allow a designated staff officer to also review mission claims and update the CAPF 10 at the request of Pennsylvania wing. This will allow wings currently utilizing wing credit cards for payment to process mission claims remotely.
60. On page 21, the second “as the” was removed from paragraph 3-6a.
61. On page 22, in paragraph 3-7, the reference to paragraph 3-5c1) was corrected to paragraph 3-7b1) through 7 to refer to the correct list.
62. On page 22, “one of” was inserted into the last sentence of paragraph 3-7b to allow personnel meeting any of the list below to qualify for check ride reimbursement. The word annual was also removed from the second to last sentence as it is redundant based on further guidance below.
63. On page 25, in paragraph 5-3b, the figure reference was corrected to Figure 5-1 to match the diagram accordingly.
64. On page 26, in paragraph 5-3c2), the chapter reference was corrected to chapter 7 to match the text.
65. On page 26, the word “ground” was added to paragraph 5-3e at the request of the Mississippi wing.
66. On page 27, in paragraph 6-3a4)a)3, the reference to the state director’s responsibilities was corrected as they are no longer responsible for SITREPs, but must be kept aware of ongoing missions.
67. Throughout chapter 6, the NOC has been incorporated into the text to receive and coordinate reports that used to be sent direct to HQ CAP/DO. The NOC has been delegated this responsibility.
68. On page 32, the chapter 7 title was changed to “INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM OVERVIEW” at the request of the Mississippi wing.
69. On page 41, paragraphs 3b1) and 3b13) were updated to reflect current mission descriptions.
70. On page 47, at the request of several wings, attachment 5, the qualified supervisor chart was updated to show like levels of incident commanders, agency liaisons, and ground team members being able to supervise themselves or personnel in lower levels of the specialty, not higher levels. The chart was also updated to allow mission pilots to supervise mission observes and to not allow transport mission pilots to supervise mission scanners. A note was also added to the chart to clarify the supervisory responsibilities of ICs, ALs, OSCs, AOBsDs,



and GBDs so that they can supervise remote activities, but should be able to verify task accomplishment.

#### Changes not incorporated into CAPR 60-3

1. The Oregon Wing requested the ability for Wing Commanders to supplement or waiver this regulation without coordination through national headquarters. The requirement for national headquarters to coordinate all supplements, waivers, operating instructions, etc. was made by the Air Force to make sure that the Air Force agrees with granting Air Force mission status to changes proposed by local units. Until the Air Force approves supplements, Air Force mission status and thus FTCA and FECA coverage can be in question.

2. Concerns were raised that CAP is not ready to go paperless in tracking its operational training. Though this is a concern, the staff was directed to reduce if not eliminate the paper tracking requirements for operational training by the end of this year. This regulation moves the majority of tracking requirements into MIMS, and leaves the remainder of paper tracking with the unit of assignment for a member that is in accordance with national board and national executive committee direction. Traditional CAPFs 101T will no longer be utilized or distributed, though there will be a sign-off sheet in each task guide for tracking of task level completion by members and supervisors. This is similar to the tracking utilized for on the job training by senior members completing specialty tracks.

3. Several comments were received noting that limiting alert officers to qualified incident commanders or agency liaisons will eliminate some personnel from serving as point of contact for missions. Unfortunately, because of problems on some missions, CAP-USAF made it clear that personnel accepting missions must be able to run those missions themselves if necessary. Some alert officers that have recently accepted missions were not prepared to do so, and CAP and the USAF is not willing to accept the liability for untrained personnel being made responsible for management of emergency services missions.

4. A comment was received from Pennsylvania wing in reference to the limitations placed by the Air Force on press releases in paragraph 1-7 on page 4. Though this will delay some press releases that had been sent directly from the incident base in the past, the Air Force determined that this was necessary based on several incident reported by agency counterparts where they had no input into releases concerning their own missions, including 1<sup>st</sup> Air Force, and this was unacceptable.

5. On page 5, in paragraph 1-9d, it was recommended to combine the last two sentences, but that would infer equal liability coverage for member-owned and third party aircraft, and that is not the Air Force's intent.

6. Several suggestions for changes were brought up to change the limitations in paragraphs 1-9 through 1-15. Some suggested moving this to chapter 5 or 6, but this was rejected as it would require redundant information to be reported in two chapters of the regulation as these policies apply to varied types of emergency services missions. Some wings and regions also suggested changes in the overall policies of these paragraphs, but the requirements outlined were drafted by the CAP-USAF/XO based on evolving DoD requirements.

7. A question was received by Oregon wing in reference to paragraph 1-16a on page 8 wondering whether the inference that support should be provided if it is known that a local agency cannot repay the Air Force is correct. This paragraph was place in the regulation by

the Air Force and is correct, so no change was made. It should be noted though that prudent judgment in providing support in immediate response situations is necessary as CAP does have a limited budget to accomplish Air Force assigned missions.

8. Several concerns were raised in reference to paragraph 1-21. Until recently there was no question from the membership if they would receive Federal Torts Claims Act (FTCA) or Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA) coverage if they had an accident on an Air Force Mission. The Air Force is expected to certify or de-certify missions for coverage to the Department of Labor, and within the last few years several missions have been de-certified which was not common in the past. The missions that were de-certified were done so because members were not acting in accordance with the regulations or the missions were not properly released. Because of this situation, the national headquarters staff, both corporate and Air Force, agreed that we should make it clear to the membership that missions must be conducted in strict accordance with the regulations.

9. Several wings suggested that paragraph 1-26a should be modified to allow for changes in aircraft lighting for use of night vision devices. At this time the Air Force is not willing to accept the risk of allowing changes to aircraft lighting systems when conducting missions.

10. The Oregon Wing questioned paragraph 1-26b, and whether or not members that are also law enforcement officers can carry their firearms on board. In reviewing the current policy with the Air Force, members that are also law enforcement officers must decide in advance what their role is. If operating as a law enforcement officer, then they cannot serve in a member capacity, i.e., serve as pilot in command, but they could carry their firearm in certain cases. If operating as a member, they cannot carry a firearm as we are the non-combatant auxiliary of the Air Force. This has been established policy for many years, and is not expected to be changed.

11. Rocky Mountain Region questioned whether or not paragraph 1-27d was necessary and should it be removed since many of these units are now a part of CAP. Though some personnel have these skills and are being allowed to use them appropriately on missions, the Air Force does not see a need to develop these skills nationwide at this time. Also, for those personnel to receive the FTCA/FECA coverage promised to them, the Air Force must be informed of their intentions to use a technical skill beforehand which is accomplished by notifying the NOC as outlined in the regulation.

12. Rocky Mountain Region suggested changing paragraph 2-3a to remove language added by the Air Force explaining the limited coverage and use of temporary members. This language was added to make it clear that members that have not completed their initial background check can only have limited participation even if they have completed their professional development requirements. This was done mainly to limit the liability exposure of the Air Force and CAP, but also to limit personnel who have not completed their FBI screening from having access to potentially sensitive materials on some homeland security missions.

13. Several wings suggested removing the requirement for CAPT 117 because they were concerned it would not be available when CAPR 60-3 is published. The continuing education exam requirement referenced throughout the regulation, CAPT 117, will be published immediately following the release of the regulation. Members will have access to the exam on-line once the regulation is approved, and in paper form shortly thereafter.

14. The Middle East Region suggested that if the certification board process put in place by a policy letter to the field was to stay in place, then it needs to be in CAPR 60-3. This idea was coordinated with the Operations Committee prior to release of the first draft of the regulation, and it was recommended that we drop this requirement. Though some wings may want or need a similar process, the majority probably do not, and those that do can do so via a supplement.

15. Several wings expressed concern with paragraphs 2-5b and c though this paragraph was not changed from previous versions of the regulation. Some commanders thought we should bar expired members from participating for longer periods so that they can focus on those that want to train. Others wanted to know what options they could waive. The short answer is that training priorities are established by the commander and the staff, so the priorities for the wing are set locally. Waivers are a different story though. The Air Force must have visibility and approval authority of waivers not noted already in the regulations (i.e., pre-requisites allowing for non-current qualifications) for members to receive FTCA and FECA coverage.

16. Mississippi wing asked that we change the references of evaluators to instructors to allow outside agencies to sign off their training, but this was not adopted. CAP has the responsibility of certifying its own member's qualifications, and to determine if that external agency training meets CAP needs. Certified evaluators are the personnel that should be signing off training as meeting CAP needs.

17. On page 20, it was suggested by Rocky Mountain Region that paragraphs, 3-3c5), 3-3c6), and 3-3c7) be changed to allow personnel that finish a higher rating or certificate to do so if the training was not established with the specific intention of doing so. This was coordinated with the Air Force, and at this time they do not want to allow members to earn ratings or certificates with appropriated funds.

18. The Virginia wing suggested removal of the requirement in paragraph 3-7a for wings to develop policies regarding who should receive funded check rides. Though this would remove one requirement, it would also burden the wing staff with justifying the payment of each individual check-ride and informing members on a case-by-case basis whether their check-ride will be funded. It also fosters unfair reimbursement practices to the membership, and does not clearly identify who will or will not be reimbursed for their check rides before taking them. Since each wing's training budget is different, and each wing has varied training requirements and priorities, having the wing publish a rationale for their use of limited funding is appropriate to minimize additional workload later.

19. The Virginia wing suggested requiring Ground Branch Directors (and thus all higher positions) to be at least Ground Team Leaders as a pre-requisites. Though this may work in some wings, there are many wings that perform very few ground team missions and thus have very few ground team leaders. Most wings do conduct many electronic searches utilizing urban direction finding teams though, and those personnel could move up to supervisory positions appropriately. We suggest that if the Virginia Wing is conducting more wilderness searches requiring ground teams instead of urban direction finding teams and supervisors with additional ground team experience, then we would support a supplement to CAPR 60-3 with this additional requirement.

20. The Mississippi wing requested a clarification of whether or not incomplete or failed check rides could be reimbursed. This is up to the wing commander to decide as part

of his or her check-ride policy based on the wing's needs, so a formal requirement was not established in the regulation.

21. The New Mexico wing raised a concern with restriction in paragraph 6-1 added to this regulation by the Air Force. Though coordinating these missions through the NOC may seem too restrictive, 1<sup>st</sup> Air Force and CAP-USAF requested a single point of contact and up front knowledge of these missions for all of CAP, so we have no choice at this time but to work these missions as requested by DoD and the Air Force.

22. A comment was received from Pennsylvania wing in reference to paragraph 6-5a3)e) that indicated that having the IC work with the state director would cause delays, and is unnecessary. Though it may seem impractical at first, this is not the case. State directors are expected to provide oversight locally, and need to be informed when critical mission support is being provided. Additionally, SITREPs are not normally provided until well into the first operating period, and the state director can often help in preparing and sending SITREPs because of their military experience. Coordination with the state director is not meant as a hurdle, but rather a helping hand to accomplishing the mission.